



Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) 2658-0234P	
	Application Number 09/837,388-Conf. #7290	Filed April 19, 2001	
	First Named Inventor Jae Y. LEE et al.		
	Art Unit 1762	Examiner J. Lin	
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p>			
<p>I am the</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> applicant /inventor.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>40,953</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. _____</p> <p><u>Esther Chong</u> Signature</p> <p><u>Esther H. Chong</u> Typed or printed name</p> <p><u>(703) 205-8000</u> Telephone number</p> <p><u>March 19, 2007</u> Date</p>			
<p>NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</p>			
<p><input type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>1</u> forms are submitted.</p>			

O I P E I A P
M A R 1 9 2007
P A T E N T & T R A D E M A R K O F F I C E

Docket No.: 2658-0234P
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Jae Y. LEE et al.

Application No.: 09/837,388

Confirmation No.: 7290

Filed: April 19, 2001

Art Unit: 1762

For: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR
PATTERNING ELECTRO-LUMINESCENT
DISPLAY DEVICE

Examiner: LIN, James

REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF CONFERENCE

MS AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the final Office Action mailed October 18, 2006, Appellants respectfully request a pre-appeal brief conference. This request is being filed concurrently with a Notice of Appeal.

This request includes:

Remarks.

REMARKS

Appellants request withdrawal of the rejections of record is being clearly erroneous in fact and in law for the reasons set forth below.

Status of Claims

Claims 9, 10 and 12-16 and 18-27 are pending in the application. Claims 9, 10 and 12-16 and 18-27 stand rejected.

Grounds Of Rejection To Be Reviewed

The first ground of rejection to be reviewed is the failure of claims 9, 10, 12-16, 18, 20, 22, 25 and 27 to be *prima facie* obvious over Pei, U.S. Patent No. 5,682,043 (hereinafter Pei), in view of Wright, U.S. Patent No. 3,661,081 (hereinafter Wright), Shinoda et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,674,553 (hereinafter Shinoda), and Kimura et al., EP 0862156 (hereinafter Kimura) (Ireton; U.S. Patent No. 4,611,539 was cited as evidence) to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The second ground of rejection to be reviewed is the failure of claims 19, 21, 23, 24 and 26 to be *prima facie* obvious over Pei in view of Wright, Shinoda and Kimura, and further in view of the other secondary reference(s) to support rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Present Invention

The present invention pertains to a method for patterning electro-luminescent display device. Independent claim 9 recites “forming barrier ribs on the substrate for preventing spread of the electroluminescent material, each barrier rib having an upper portion; forming pixel

electrodes between the barrier ribs; applying the electroluminescent material to the lands of the molding plate, wherein the electroluminescent material includes a polymer solution; and printing the electroluminescent material on the lands from the molding plate onto the pixels electrodes between the barrier ribs by rotating the molding roller, thereby patterning the electroluminescent display during said step of printing, wherein the upper portions of the barrier ribs are in contact with the pixel electrodes and the electroluminescent material on the pixel electrodes.”

Independent claim 27 recites “forming barrier ribs on a substrate for preventing spread of the electroluminescent material, each barrier rib having an upper portion; forming pixel electrodes on the substrate between the barrier ribs; applying the electroluminescent material to the lands of the molding plate, wherein the electroluminescent material includes a polymer solution; and printing the electroluminescent material on the lands from the molding plate onto the pixels electrodes between the barrier ribs by rotating the molding roller, thereby patterning the electroluminescent display during said step of printing, wherein the upper portions of the barrier ribs are in contact with the pixel electrodes and the electroluminescent material on the pixel electrodes.”

Distinctions Of The Invention Over The Applied Art

Pei discloses printing composite material by flexographic printing. As provided by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action, “flexography” is defined as “a process of rotary letterpress printing using flexible plates and fast drying inks” and “letterpress” is defined as “the process of printing from an inked raised surface esp. when the paper is impressed directly on the surface.”

The Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Pei and Wright fail to teach forming barrier ribs. However, the Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify Pei in view of Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240. Appellants respectfully disagree. In fact, one skilled in the art would not have the motivation to modify Pei's flexographic printing with Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240 because Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240 would *interfere with Pei's flexographic printing.*

As shown in Shinoda and Kimura, the material is deposited in an area between adjacent barriers or interlevel insulation films by screening printing (Shinoda) or direct injection (Kimura) to make sure that the material will be deposited into the pixel area defined by Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240. However, by applying Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240 to Pei's flexographic printing, Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240 may be in contact with the composite material on the rotary flexible plates during the flexographic printing process, which causes misplacement of the composite material. In other words, the composite material will not be precisely deposited at the desired locations (*i.e.*, pixel areas) and may be located at the *undesired* locations (*i.e.*, on top of the barriers or interlevel insulation films) due to the interference of the barriers or interlevel insulation films with the rotary flexible plates.

Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240 are used to define the pixel areas and to facilitate deposition of the material into the defined, desired areas by screening printing or direct injection. However, when applying them to Pei's flexographic printing, Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240 may interfere with the rotary

flexible plates, thereby depositing the material *outside the defined, desired areas*, which is undesirable. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not have the motivation as suggested by the Examiner to modify Pei's flexographic printing in view of Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240.

Accordingly, the invention as recited in claims 9 and 27 and their dependent claims (at least due to their dependency) is patentable over the applied references, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09/0461 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther Chong
Esther H. Chong
Registration No.: 40,953
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant